

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORKUSDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: 06/16/2025

-----X
 BLAKE LIVELY, :
 Plaintiff, : 24-cv-10049 (lead case);
 : 25-cv-449
 -v- :
 WAYFARER STUDIOS LLC, JUSTIN BALDONI, :
 JAMEY HEATH, STEVE SAROWITZ, IT ENDS WITH :
 US MOVIE LLC, MELISSA NATHAN, THE AGENCY :
 GROUP PR LLC, JENNIFER ABEL, JED WALLACE, :
 STREET RELATIONS INC., :
 Defendants. :
 -----X

WAYFARER STUDIOS LLC, JUSTIN BALDONI, :
 JAMEY HEATH, IT ENDS WITH US MOVIE LLC, :
 MELISSA NATHAN, JENNIFER ABEL, STEVE :
 SAROWITZ, :
 Plaintiffs, :
 -----X

BLAKE LIVELY, RYAN REYNOLDS, LESLIE :
 SLOANE, VISION PR, INC., THE NEW YORK TIMES :
 COMPANY, :
 Defendants. :
 -----X

LEWIS J. LIMAN, United States District Judge:

Blake Lively (“Lively”) moves to compel Wayfarer Studios LLC (“Wayfarer”) and Tera Hanks, Mitz Toskovic, Ahmed Musiol, Ashmi Elizabeth Dang, Shekinah Reese, Jariesse Blackmon, AJ Marbory, Dion Suleman, and Jennifer Benson (the “Wayfarer Third Parties”) to produce material in response to certain subpoenas (the “Subpoenas”) served upon them in March of 2025 and requiring compliance in March of 2025. Dkt. No. 200; *see* Dkt. Nos. 200-1–200-9.

Lively states that as of June 11, 2025, the Wayfarer Third Parties have not produced any document responsive to the Subpoenas. Dkt. No. 316. The Wayfarer Third Parties state that they are still collecting documents and additionally argue that this Court lacks jurisdiction to compel compliance. Dkt. Nos. 215, 328.

Each of the Subpoenas requires compliance in Los Angeles, California, except for the Subpoena to Dion Suleman, which requires compliance in Atlanta, Georgia. *See* Dkt. Nos. 200-1–200-9. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 states that “the serving party may move the court for the district where compliance is required for an order compelling production or inspection.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(2)(B)(i); *see* Moore’s Federal Practice § 45.41[2][a] (3d ed. 2024) (“A motion to compel compliance . . . must be brought in a court in the district where compliance is required.”). This provision protects the interests of nonparties over which the Court may not have jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 45, advisory committee notes to 2013 amendment (“To protect local nonparties, local resolution of disputes about subpoenas is assured by the limitations of Rule 45(c) and the requirements in Rules 45(d) and (e) that motions be made in the court in which compliance is required under Rule 45(c).”); *Gucci Am., Inc. v. Weixing Li*, 135 F. Supp. 3d 87, 93 (S.D.N.Y. 2015) (“A district court must have personal jurisdiction over a nonparty to compel it to comply with a Rule 45 subpoena.”); *JMC Rest. Holdings, LLC v. Pevida*, 2015 WL 2240492, at *2–3 (E.D.N.Y. May 12, 2015). Lively’s motion is properly brought in the districts where compliance is required.

The motion to compel at Dkt. No. 200 is DENIED.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close Dkt. No. 200.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 16, 2025
New York, New York



LEWIS J. LIMAN
United States District Judge